

R E M A R K S

Only claim 5 now includes sub-paragraphs f)-----n) corresponding to sub-paragraphs i)-----ix) of claim 8, defining the electrode. Sub-paragraphs k) and m) are further defined. Claim 8 adds the definition of the tip flat end defining the major extent of the tip.


It is believed and urged that the specific totality of claim 5, as now amended, is new and unobvious over the cited and applied art, including Cramer, and Cramer in view of Wood, for reasons which include the following:

- Wood at col.7, lines 17-20 does not teach or suggest applicant's claim 5, sub-paragraph e) blunted tip flat end and a shallowly tapered periphery, or claim 8 now defining the flat end defining the major extent of the tip. Wood instead has a hemispherically rounded tip (see Figs. 3, 6 and 7). Therefore, Cramer in view of Woods fails to teach or suggest claims 5 or 8.
- The combination of all of the recited features of claim 5 and/or 8 with defined approximate dimensions is not suggested by Cramer taken with or without Wood. Cramer appears to lack

Serial No. 10/808,838

teaching of the first section taper of approximately 3.0 degrees along the majority of that section length. He teaches a shaft tubing of $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ inches OD (col. 5, lines 66 and 67) which is a teaching of cylindricality. Also applicant's claims 5 and 8 defined flat end bluntness combined with taper as defined is clearly not suggested by the cited art. Such flat end bluntness compacts the earth at all positions of the probe drive into the earth to optimize electrical contact (probe to earth); also such bluntness prevents probe bending at its tip, as the probe end strikes rocks. The shallowly tapered periphery around the flat end facilitates and guides driving into the earth. Allowance is urged.

Respectfully submitted,


William W. Haefliger
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 17,120
Area Code 323 684-2707

WWH:hk

Docket 12,866